

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 108, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—313

Aderholt	English	Lewis (KY)
Andrews	Etheridge	Linder
Archer	Everett	Lipinski
Armey	Ewing	LoBiondo
Bachus	Fletcher	Lucas (KY)
Baird	Foley	Lucas (OK)
Baker	Forbes	Maloney (CT)
Ballenger	Fossella	Maloney (NY)
Barcia	Fowler	Manzullo
Barr	Frank (MA)	McCarthy (MO)
Barrett (NE)	Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Barton	Frost	McCrery
Bass	Galleghy	McHugh
Bateman	Ganske	McInnis
Bentsen	Gekas	McIntosh
Bereuter	Gibbons	McIntyre
Berkley	Gilchrest	McKeon
Berry	Gillmor	Meeks (NY)
Biggart	Gilman	Menendez
Bilbray	Gonzalez	Metcalfe
Bilirakis	Goode	Mica
Bishop	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Blagojevich	Goodling	Miller, Gary
Bliley	Gordon	Minge
Blumenauer	Goss	Mollohan
Blunt	Graham	Moore
Boehlert	Granger	Moran (KS)
Boehner	Green (WI)	Moran (VA)
Bonilla	Greenwood	Morella
Bono	Gutknecht	Myrick
Boswell	Hall (TX)	Napolitano
Boucher	Hansen	Neal
Boyd	Hastert	Nethercutt
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Ney
Bryant	Hayes	Northup
Burr	Hayworth	Norwood
Burton	Hefley	Nussle
Buyer	Herger	Ortiz
Callahan	Hill (IN)	Ose
Calvert	Hill (MT)	Oxley
Camp	Hilleary	Packard
Campbell	Hinojosa	Pallone
Canady	Hobson	Pascarell
Cannon	Hoekstra	Pastor
Capps	Holden	Paul
Cardin	Holt	Pease
Castle	Hooley	Peterson (MN)
Chabot	Horn	Peterson (PA)
Chambliss	Hostettler	Petri
Chenoweth	Houghton	Phelps
Clement	Hoyer	Pickering
Coble	Hulshof	Pickett
Coburn	Hunter	Pitts
Collins	Hyde	Pombo
Combest	Inslee	Pomeroy
Condit	Isakson	Porter
Cook	Istook	Portman
Cooksey	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Costello	Jenkins	Pryce (OH)
Cox	John	Quinn
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Crane	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Regula
Cunningham	Kaptur	Reyes
Danner	Kasich	Reynolds
Davis (FL)	Kelly	Riley
Davis (VA)	Kennedy	Rivers
Deal	Kind (WI)	Roemer
DeLay	King (NY)	Rogan
DeMint	Kingston	Rogers
Deusch	Klecza	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickey	Kolbe	Rothman
Dicks	Kuykendall	Roukema
Dooley	LaHood	Royce
Doolittle	Lampson	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	Largent	Ryun (KS)
Duncan	Larson	Salmon
Dunn	Latham	Sandlin
Ehlers	Lazio	Sanford
Ehrlich	Leach	Saxton
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Scarborough

Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence

Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt

Toomey
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NAYS—108

Abercrombie
Allen
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Gejdenson
Green (TX)

Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley

Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Stupak
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman
Becerra
Berman
Brown (CA)
Gephardt

Hutchinson
LaTourette
Luther
Simpson
Slaughter
Watts (OK)
Wynn
Young (FL)

□ 1907

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. LAMPSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, if I were present, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 833, the Bankruptcy Reform Act.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on final passage of H.R. 833 due to a family emergency. However, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, and 115.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" or "aye" on rollcall votes 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 114 and "no" or "nay" on rollcall votes 109 and 115.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 833, BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 833, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross-references, and punctuation, and to make such stylistic, clerical, technical, conforming, and other changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CONFLICT IN THE BALKANS AND HOW THAT CONFLICT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED

(Mr. BATEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATEMAN. Madam Speaker, we have stumbled through, I think, inept decision-making into a conflict in the Balkans. Last Wednesday we debated that issue. At the end of the day we had declared no policy, approved no policy, condemned no policy. I think that is an evasion of our moral, if not constitutional, responsibility.

So today, I will introduce a resolution which seeks to declare a policy with reference to that conflict and how it should be conducted, as well as how the cost of it should be borne and shared among our allies, and how we should deal with the question of indicted war criminals as a part of any agreement, and termination of that conflict. I solicit the review and hopefully the co-patronage of this resolution by my colleagues.

The United States Congress has been debating whether and to what extent our country should be involved in the conflict between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I cannot find words strong enough to condemn the miserable performance of the Congress thus far. No American to date knows whether the Congress of the United States approves or condemns the policy of the Commander in Chief. Our fellow citizens will not know, because we as their collective national leadership have steadfastly refused to either approve or disapprove, condemn or condone, any policy. We have done this even in the context of a solemn debate by some about our constitutional responsibility and the War Powers Act.

Last week we ensured that the House of Representatives would bear no responsibility

for the military action against Yugoslavia. We declared no policy, we disapproved of no policy. We didn't accept the reality that our nation has led the NATO alliance into a conflict. By a majority vote, we asserted that our Commander in Chief could not commit ground forces—whatever that means—without our specific prior approval. We then by a tie vote failed to approve even the continuation of the ongoing conflict into which we had been injected by our President.

I cannot tell you how much I have agonized over the sorry, inept, and clumsy failure of those who determine our national security policy in this latest phases of the ongoing Balkan crisis. Even the prior Administration, so confident during the Gulf War, failed to lead when it could and should have in the Balkans.

Without direction or credible leadership we have become deeply embroiled in this conflict. We are without any clear delineation of the reason or importance of our being involved or of what represents a successful conclusion to the conflict. We are in this conflict with an announced policy that we will not commit ground forces, a position that serves our enemy's interest but undermines our objectives, whatever they are. I submit that it is the height of irresponsibility for the Congress of the United States to abdicate their responsibility to either approve or disapprove a Kosovo policy.

If the President and his, to use the most charitable reference, "national security team" have produced a national policy disaster, we should say so. We should not evade the issue. If the administration is correct in its assertion that the barbarism attributed to the leadership of Yugoslavia demands a military response, we should endorse this conclusion.

There are those whose political judgement tells them Congress should not act on this matter, because if we do, we might have to assume responsibility. I categorically object to any such notion. Our President may have failed to call upon the Congress to support his policy in the Balkans, but the Congress has a duty to speak out anyway. We have a constitutional duty whether the President ask us for our approval or not. Perhaps the constitutional duty is higher when the President seeks to evade us and his policy is muddled.

Last Wednesday, I voted no on all four resolutions regarding the conflict against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I seriously considered voting no even on the Rule regarding our debate, because under the Rule, we could not make, approve or disapprove any policy. We trivialized the role of the Congress and that is fraught with dire consequences for the future.

The Congress of the United States makes policy and our politics ought to crystallize conflicting views of good or bad policy. Last week we failed in this. For this reason I am offering a joint resolution regarding the conflict in the Balkans.

The resolution is critical of how we came to the sorry choices before us, but recognizes that our country is confronted with certain realities which it must confront. The choice the resolution makes is to give congressional authorization to the ongoing military conflict against the regime of Slobodan Milosevic. It does not presume to give political guidance to how the conflict is waged and bespeaks a concern only that it be waged with sound military judgement, consistent with the earliest victory and least casualties.

Most importantly, it enunciates a policy and identifies goals, which if correct fully justify our

involvement and leadership into this conflict. If not correct, clearly the resolution should not be supported and should fail. How dare we, on a matter of such consequence, stand by and declare neither war nor even any policy. Are not our armed forces entitled to know that their Congress approves or disapproves of what they are doing on the orders of our Commander in Chief? Certainly they must hope that the elected representatives of our people will not choose to abdicate their responsibility.

The resolution I offer speaks to the financial burden of this conflict in the bosom of Europe, and asserts a policy that the costs should be fairly allocated among the entire NATO alliance.

My resolution also asserts that any agreement that concludes this unhappy chapter in our history should exempt no one from prosecution who is or may be indicted by the appropriate judicial authority as a war criminal.

It is not an easy resolution. It is not meant as political confrontation. It nonetheless confronts all of us with the inescapable duty to declare a policy and decide whether we should be involved in, go forward with, or repudiate our involvement in the ongoing conflict with Yugoslavia.

Oh, yes the choices are not easy, but how dare we not even make a choice and deign to call ourselves the elected representatives of our people.

I solicit your advice and would appreciate your cosponsorship of this resolution.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as one of only three nurses in Congress, it is my great honor today to rise in support of National Nurses Week.

My training and education as a nurse and my 20 years in my profession in the schools of Santa Barbara in the public

school district have given me a unique perspective on my new duties in Congress. As a nurse, I have learned to recognize the importance of so many issues which affect families every day, families in my community, in my congressional district, families across this great country.

□ 1915

Nurses are good listeners. They withhold superficial, quick judgments and take the time to assess situations before them, before they act accordingly. Nurses use common sense skills to put the common good before individual interests.

My nursing background has had the strongest influence on my priorities in Congress. As a nurse, I feel that it has been my duty and also my privilege to speak out on behalf of patients and health care providers on what is the critical task before us today. We know what is before us in the world where life and death situations take place, and we also see so clearly the current shortcomings in our health care environment.

I sought a seat on the Committee on Commerce which oversees health care so that I could be a part of this discussion. In the age of managed care, where values are often driven by profit motives over health care needs, nurses have been presented with critical new challenges.

I have stood with nurses in my district in their frustration over staffing ratios in our hospitals, in our communities. I have been with nurses as they have shed tears over having to discharge frail elderly patients before they are really ready to go home into home situations where there is not adequate health care and support.

Nurses know that we should not compromise a patient's quality of care to save a few dollars. Nurses understand the real benefits of real managed care reform.

I have been working hard with Republicans and Democrats to pass a common sense Patients' Bill of Rights, legislation which will put patients, nurses, doctors and other providers back in charge of their own health care and holds HMOs accountable when they deny critical, sometimes lifesaving, treatment.

Nurses know these basic rights can mean the difference between life and death and between a quality of life that they have spent their profession and their training to uphold. They can and they should and we are speaking out.

The Subcommittee on Health and Environment, on which I am privileged to serve, has held only one hearing so far on managed care reform. In that hearing I called for greater participation of nurses. Nurses can and will make valuable additions in this discussion and in the debate before us.

In Congress, there is also other legislation originally drafted by a nurse that will protect nurses and other health care workers in all States. The